

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MAINE

DARRELL C.,

PLAINTIFF

V.

**ANDREW M. SAUL, COMMISSIONER,
SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,**

DEFENDANT

CIVIL No. 1:18-cv-338-DBH

ORDER ON MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

In this social security disability and supplemental security income appeal, the parties first argued their positions before the Magistrate Judge. He issued a Recommended Decision (ECF No. 23), and the parties argued the correctness of his decision in briefing to me. I also held oral argument. Then on February 5, 2020, I issued an Order affirming in part and rejecting in part the Recommended Decision (ECF No. 32). The Commissioner next moved for reconsideration under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e) (ECF No. 34), and the parties briefed their positions once again.

I **DENY** the motion for reconsideration. At this stage, it is for the First Circuit to decide whether my decision was correct or incorrect. The decision was not “a manifest error of law,” the standard for a motion for reconsideration, Ruiz

Rivera v. Pfizer Pharm., LLC, 521 F.3d 76, 81-82 (1st Cir. 2008),¹ that would keep this dispute still longer in the trial court.

SO ORDERED.

DATED THIS 22ND DAY OF APRIL, 2020

/s/D. BROCK HORNBY

D. BROCK HORNBY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ The other grounds for such a motion—“newly discovered evidence,” “patently misunder[standing] a party,” or “an error not of reasoning but apprehension,” Ruiz Rivera, 521 F.3d at 81-82—are not pertinent here.